UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,739	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.099US1	9937

45809 7590 10/13/2005

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/557,739	GJERSTAD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J. Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 September 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,9 and 12-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,9 and 12-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE amendment filed 9/27/2004.

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, and 12-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 9, and 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 9, and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 5/10/1996.

Regarding independent claim 1, Saunders teaches an application program owning a document in fig. 1. Saunders teaches a plurality of input device handlers, each handler having a corresponding input device and capable of entering text into the document in fig. 1 and col. 1 line 66 – col. 2 line 5. Saunders teaches each handler also having a method callable by the application program to request at least one of: that the handler return correction content for display by the application program itself for text specified by the application program that was entered into the document by the handler, and that the handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the text specified by the application program that was entered into the document by the handler in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Saunders teaches in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32 a reservation system which defines a ranged portion of text and reserves the portion of text to a particular input device handler via a reservation identifier taught in col. 6 lines 55-67. The reservation identifier taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67 is an attached property to each identified contiguous range of text identifying the single handler for the contiguous range of text. Saunders teaches a correction interface callable by the application program after initial entry of the specified text portion into the document, to determine a responsible handler for the specified text portion in the document in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches wherein the correction interface determines the responsible handler based on the attached identifier property, and calls the responsible handler for correction in fig. 5, and col. 7 lines 1-17.

Saunders does not teach that a range of text is necessarily reserved only for the input device handler which originally enters a specified portion of text into the document. In Saunders, the range of text can be released so that access is available to other text input device handlers if the attached property identifier has a zero value as is taught by Saunders in col. 6 lines 55-67. Saunders does not teach that the identifier is necessarily permanently associated with a range of text and therefore does not specifically teach a tracking mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text by maintaining an association between each handler and the specified portion of text it enters into the document. Saunders does not teach that the ranged portion of text is necessarily released by the associated text input device handler when the text input device is finished inputting new or updated text. Therefore, as long as the identifier property of Saunders for each range of text was maintained as a non-zero value, the identifier would have maintained a permanent association between the text input device handler and each

ranged portion of text to have tracked the initial entry of each specified portion of text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the association between each handler and the text it enters into the document so that the correction of the text would have maintained a continuity of being corrected by the same handler that entered the text. This would have facilitated access to the associated portion of text as is taught by the reservation system of Saunders in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 17.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Saunders teaches an application program which calls the method of an input device to request at least that the responsible handler return the correction content such that the application program manages correction of the specified text itself in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 16-51, and col. 7 lines 1-17.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Saunders teaches an application program which calls the method of the responsible handler to request at least that the handler display a correction interface thereof such that the handler manages correction of the specified text itself in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 16-51, and col. 7 lines 1-17.

Regarding independent claim 6, Saunders teaches in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32 a reservation system which defines a ranged portion of text and reserves the portion of text to a particular input device handler via a reservation identifier taught in col. 6 lines 55-67. The reservation identifier taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67 is an attached property to each identified contiguous range of text identifying the single handler for the contiguous range of text. Saunders teaches a correction interface callable by the application program after initial text entry

to determine a responsible input device handler for the specified text portion in the document in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches wherein the correction interface determines the responsible handler based on the attached identifier property, and calls the responsible handler for correction of the contiguous range of text in fig. 5, and col. 7 lines 1-17.

Saunders does not teach that a range of text is necessarily reserved only for the input device handler which originally enters a specified portion of text into the document. In Saunders, the range of text can be released so that access is available to other text input device handlers if the attached property identifier has a zero value as is taught by Saunders in col. 6 lines 55-67. Saunders does not teach that the identifier is necessarily permanently associated with a range of text and therefore does not specifically teach a tracking mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text by maintaining an association between each handler and the specified portion of text it enters into the document. However, Saunders does not teach that the ranged portion of text is released by an associated text input device handler when the text input device is finished inputting new or updated text. Therefore, the identifier property of Saunders could have been permanently associated with a ranged portion of text to track the initial entry of each specified portion of text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the association between each handler and the text it enters into the document so that the correction of the text would have maintained a continuity of being corrected by the same handler that entered the text. This would have facilitated access to the associated portion of text as is taught by the reservation system of Saunders in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 17.

Regarding independent claim 9, Saunders teaches entering text into a document owned by an application by a handler for an input device, via a common text framework governing interaction between the application and the handler for the input device, such that the application exposes the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 4, col. 1 lines 55-65 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders teaches in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32 a reservation system which defines a ranged portion of text and reserves the portion of text to a particular input device handler via a reservation identifier taught in col. 6 lines 55-67. The reservation identifier taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67 is an attached property to each identified contiguous range of text identifying the single handler for the contiguous range of text. Saunders teaches requesting of the common text framework by the application of an identity of a particular input device handler associated with a specified text portion in the document in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches returning by the common text framework to the application the identity of the particular handler associated with the specified range of text in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches requesting by the application of correction information from the particular handler in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Saunders does not teach that a range of text is necessarily reserved only for the input device handler which originally enters a specified portion of text into the document. In Saunders, the range of text can be released so that access is available to other text input device handlers if the attached property identifier has a zero value as is taught by Saunders in col. 6 lines 55-67. Saunders does not teach that the identifier is necessarily permanently associated with a range of text and therefore does not specifically teach a tracking mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text by maintaining an association between each handler

and the specified portion of text it enters into the document. However, Saunders does not teach that the ranged portion of text is released by an associated text input device handler when the text input device is finished inputting new or updated text. Therefore, the identifier property of Saunders could have been permanently associated with a ranged portion of text to track the initial entry of each specified portion of text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the association between each handler and the text it enters into the document so that the correction of the text would have maintained a continuity of being corrected by the same handler that entered the text. This would have facilitated access to the associated portion of text as is taught by the reservation system of Saunders in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 17.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Saunders teaches in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32 a reservation system which defines a ranged portion of text and reserves the portion of text to a particular input device handler via a reservation identifier taught in col. 6 lines 55-67. The reservation identifier taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67 is an attached property to each identified contiguous range of text identifying the single handler for the contiguous range of text. Saunders does not teach that a range of text is necessarily reserved only for the input device handler which originally enters a specified portion of text into the document. In Saunders, the range of text can be released so that access is available to other text input device handlers if the attached property identifier has a zero value as is taught by Saunders in col. 6 lines 55-67.

Saunders does not teach that the identifier is necessarily permanently associated with a range of text and therefore does not specifically teach a tracking mechanism to track initial entry

of each specified portion of text by maintaining an association between each handler and the specified portion of text it enters into the document. However, Saunders does not teach that the ranged portion of text is released by an associated text input device handler when the text input device is finished inputting new or updated text. Therefore, the identifier property of Saunders could have been permanently associated with a ranged portion of text to track the initial entry of each specified portion of text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the association between each handler and the text it enters into the document so that the correction of the text would have maintained a continuity of being corrected by the same handler that entered the text. This would have facilitated access to the associated portion of text as is taught by the reservation system of Saunders in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 17.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Saunders teaches requesting by the application of the particular handler to return correction content for the specified text for display by the application itself in fig. 4, col. 1 lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-16, and col. 6 lines 11-38. Saunders teaches returning by the particular handler to the application the correction content for the specified text in fig. 4, col. 2 lines 6-51, and col. 6 lines 11-38.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Saunders teaches displaying by the application of the correction content in col. 2 lines 30-51, col. 6 lines 28-38, and col. 7 lines 1-17.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Saunders teaches an application which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 30-51, col. 6 lines 28-38, and col. 7 lines 1-17.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Saunders teaches requesting by the application of a particular handler that the particular handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-30, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches displaying by a particular handler of the correction interface in fig. 4, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 6-51, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Saunders teaches a particular handler which manages corrections to the specified text itself in fig. 4, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 6-51, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Saunders teaches requesting by the application of a particular handler that the particular handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-30, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches displaying by a particular handler of the correction interface in fig. 4, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 6-51, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Saunders teaches a particular handler which manages corrections to the specified text itself in fig. 4, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 6-51, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Regarding independent claim 20, Saunders teaches entering text into a document owned by an application by a handler for an input device, via a common text framework governing interaction between the application and the handler for the input device, such that the application exposes the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 4, col. 1 lines 55-65 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders teaches in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32 a reservation system which defines a ranged portion of text and reserves the portion of text to a

particular input device handler via a reservation identifier taught in col. 6 lines 55-67. The reservation identifier taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67 is an attached property to each identified contiguous range of text identifying the single handler for the contiguous range of text. Saunders teaches requesting of the common text framework by the application of an identity of a particular input device handler associated with a specified text portion in the document in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches returning by the common text framework to the application the identity of the particular handler associated with the specified range of text in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32. Saunders teaches requesting by the application program, after initial text processing and after returning of the identity of the particular handler, of the particular handler at least one of that the handler return correction content for display by the application itself for the specified text and that the handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4, fig. 5, and col. 6 line 11 – col. 7 line 32.

Saunders does not teach that a range of text is necessarily reserved only for the input device handler which originally enters a specified portion of text into the document. In Saunders, the range of text can be released so that access is available to other text input device handlers if the attached property identifier has a zero value as is taught by Saunders in col. 6 lines 55-67. Saunders does not teach that the identifier is necessarily permanently associated with a range of text and therefore does not specifically teach a tracking mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text by maintaining an association between each handler and the specified portion of text it enters into the document. However, Saunders does not teach that the ranged portion of text is released by an associated text input device handler when the text

input device is finished inputting new or updated text. Therefore, the identifier property of Saunders could have been permanently associated with a ranged portion of text to track the initial entry of each specified portion of text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the association between each handler and the text it enters into the document so that the correction of the text would have maintained a continuity of being corrected by the same handler that entered the text. This would have facilitated access to the associated portion of text as is taught by the reservation system of Saunders in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 17.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 7-10 that Saunders fails to teach or suggest any type of tracking mechanism or attaching a property to the range of text in order to track the source of the text, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Upon further consideration of the teaching of the cited prior art the Examiner has ceased using the reference of Covington to teach attaching a property to a range of text in order to provide access to original based on the Examiner's improved understanding of this property and its purpose. The Examiner believes that Saunders in fact does teach attaching a property to a range of text in col. 6 lines 28-38. Saunders teaches in that both an owner and unique identifier properties are attached to the selected text range. The Examiner believes this is a mechanism to track an association between a

contiguous range of text and a text input device handler. Saunders describes in col. 6 lines 55-67 how the identifier determines the reservation based on its value. Thus, as long as the identifier is maintained as a non-zero value, Saunders maintains an association between a text input device handler and the range of text. Therefore, by maintaining the associating identifier between a text input device handler and the range of text it enters, the associating mechanism would have then been a tracking mechanism as claimed. The Examiner believes the suggestion contained in Saunders to use the associating mechanism as tracking mechanism is contained in col. 6 lines 28-38. In this passage Saunders teaches that an owner is associated with a range of text. This suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that the text input device handler which originally enters the text could be the owner of the text and thus would have had an exclusive association with the associated contiguous range of text as in the claimed invention. The association would have been maintained through the unique identifier property attached to the associated range of text. For these reasons the Examiner believes Saunders teaches attaching a property to a range of text and suggests a tracking mechanism based on the taught reservation system.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Maslov, US 6,466,240 B1 provisional filed 7/8/1998 discloses transforming structured text. Froessl, US 5,109,439 patented 4/28/1992 discloses preserving originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. Isokoski et al., "Quickwriting as a Multi-Device Text Entry Method", published by ACM, October 2004, pages 105-108 discloses multi-device text entry.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
10/11/2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/11/2005